Fall 2013

Location, Location, Location: The Importance of Proximity in Student Peer Evaluation

Roger White
Whittier College, rwhite1@whittier.edu

Pennsylvania Economic Review
Volume 20, Number 2, Fall 2013

LOCATION, LOCATION, LOCATION: THE IMPORTANCE OF PROXIMITY IN STUDENT PEER EVALUATION

Roger White
Franklin & Marshall College and Whittier College

ABSTRACT

The appropriateness of physical distances as a proxy for interpersonal networks is examined using data on peer evaluation scores collected from undergraduate student presentations in econometrics courses during the spring 2010 and spring 2011 semesters at Franklin & Marshall College. Employing the Tobit regression technique and decomposing the resulting coefficient estimates into marginal effects, we find that greater physical distance is negatively related to peer evaluation scores in the sense that greater distance lowers scores and reduces the likelihood that the evaluating student will assign the maximum possible score. Similarly, evaluating students assign higher scores to those student presenters they consider friends.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, largely due to increased interest in experimental methods and the development and refinement of associated analytical tools, researchers have sought to better understand the influence of interpersonal networks on economics-related behavior. While some examination of the relationship between interpersonal networks and behavior has been undertaken, the topic largely remains marked by open empirical questions. One such question is whether physical distance is an appropriate proxy for interpersonal networks. Hall (1969) suggests a relationship between physical distance and the strength of interpersonal relationships/networks by identifying four interpersonal bodily distances: intimate distance (up to 1.5 feet) for embracing, touching or whispering, personal distance (1.5 to 4 feet) for conversations among good friends, social-consultative distance (4 to 10 feet) for conversations among acquaintances, and public distance (10 to 30 feet) for public speaking. In this paper, we consider whether physical distance is an appropriate proxy variable for interpersonal distance and, hence, for the strength (or weakness) of interpersonal networks.

To address our research question, we examine data collected from students enrolled in undergraduate econometrics courses. Information relating to the students' perceived quality of their peers' research presentations has been mapped to data on student demographics, course performances, which students in the class they identify as either friends or as acquaintances, and the physical distance between where evaluating students and presenting students chose to sit in the classroom. It is commonly accepted that interpersonal networks confer benefits to members

through ease of communication (and, thus, greater information sharing), through the granting of favors, and as a result of reduced search costs. Thus, our *a priori* expectation is that greater physical distance corresponds with weaker interpersonal relationships/networks and, thus, with lower evaluation grades. This expected relationship is based on two assumptions: i) students will award inflated grades to peers they view as friends or acquaintances and ii) students are more likely to sit near to classmates they consider to be friends or acquaintances and farther from those peers they do not know well.

Employing the Tobit regression technique and decomposing resulting coefficient estimates into marginal effects, the data allow for estimation of the influences of distance and whether an evaluating student views a presenting student as a friend or acquaintance, as well as the influences of other explanatory variables, on 1) the level of the overall grades assigned through the peer evaluation process and 2) the likelihood that evaluators will assign the maximum grade possible. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine physical distance as a potential proxy variable for the influence of interpersonal networks on student peer evaluation.

The results indicate that greater physical distance is negatively related to peer evaluation scores in the sense that greater distance lowers scores and reduces the likelihood that the evaluating student will assign the maximum possible score. In addition to the use of the Tobit technique to estimate a series of baseline and augmented regression specifications, the Ordinary Least Squares technique is applied to the full data sample and to a sub-sample which includes only observations for which the dependent variable is uncensored. The consistency of coefficients, in terms of magnitude, sign and statistical significance, is taken as an indication of the robustness of the primary results.

We proceed as follows. The next section introduces the data and provides details regarding variable construction, the regression model, and our empirical strategy. We follow with a presentation of the estimation results, and the final section concludes.

DATA, VARIABLE CONSTRUCTION, AND EMPIRICAL SPECIFICATION

The data employed in this study were collected from undergraduate students enrolled in econometrics courses at Franklin & Marshall College during the spring 2010 and spring 2011 semesters.[1] Franklin & Marshall College is a small, private, residential liberal arts college. It has approximately 2,350 full-time students, an average class size of 18-19 students, and a faculty-student ratio of 9-to-1. All students in both econometrics classes were of traditional college age, and all were sophomores, juniors, or seniors. The majority of students in the two econometrics courses were Economics majors; however, several other majors were represented – including Business, Organizations and Society, Mathematics, Government, and History.

For both courses, students were required to complete an econometrics project. The projects were significant components of the courses and accounted for 20 percent of their course grade (i.e., 15 percent for the final paper and 5 percent for the presentation of their research to the class). Students were required to i) have their paper topic approved by the end of the 7th week of the 15 week semester, ii) submit a draft version of the research paper at the beginning of the 12th week, iii) present the project and results contained in the paper draft to the class during either the 14th or 15th week of the semester, and iv) submit a final research paper one week following the end of classes.

Students were not required to critique drafts of their peers' research papers, but throughout the semester they were encouraged to work collaboratively on their homework/ problem set assignments. Specifically, during each semester, four problem sets were assigned. The course syllabus reads, in part, "You are permitted/encouraged to work collectively on these assignments. To that end, you may work in groups of up to three students and submit a single assignment with all associated names listed." While some students may have been friends or

acquaintances with other class members prior to the start of the semester, it is also possible that students became friends due to their interaction during the semester. Thus, the structure of the course assignments may have contributed to the establishment of new and/or the strengthening of existing interpersonal relationships.

PEER EVALUATION DATA

During the presentations, each student presenter was evaluated by her/his peers. Due to time constraints (the 2010 class met for 80 minutes twice weekly while the 2011 class met for 50 minutes three times per week) and incomplete drafts, not all students presented their research. During the spring 2010 course 19 of 20 enrolled students presented their findings, and in the spring 2011 course 16 of 22 students presented their research. The same Presentation Evaluation Sheet was used for both classes.[2] Incomplete evaluation sheets were excluded from our data set. This resulted in the final data set consisting of 568 observations representing 35 student presentations.

To reduce potential evaluation bias, students were not informed of the data collection process during either semester. The class members were asked to provide peer evaluation and, to encourage students to take their roles seriously, it was explained that 1) presenting students would receive the evaluation sheets after the evaluating students' names were removed from the sheets, and 2) that the peer evaluation scores would be considered when presentation grades were determined. The students were not, however, given any information on how large (or small) a weight their evaluations would have when presentation scores were determined.

The evaluation sheet asks students a series of questions that are grouped into four categories: 1) general understanding; 2) delivery; 3) clarity; and 4) visual aids. In total, these categories include nine questions. Additionally, the evaluation sheet contains a final question that asks evaluating students to assign an overall grade (ranging in value from 1 to 10). The responses to this final question – that is, the 'grade' assigned by an evaluating student to her/his peer – serve as the dependent variable series for this study. Accordingly, our dependent variable is considered a measure of the overall quality of the students' research presentations as perceived by the presenting students' peers.

EMPIRICAL SPECIFICATION

Given that the dependent variable series ranges from 1 to 10 and that 20.3 percent of the observations in our dataset (i.e., 115 of the 568 dependent variable values) are at the upper limit, the Tobit estimation technique is employed. No students assigned a score at the lower end of the grade spectrum. Thus, the dependent variable series is censored only at the upper limit. In addition to being an appropriate estimation technique when a considerable proportion of the dependent variable observations are equal to a censored lower and/or upper limit, the Tobit technique offers an additional benefit in that resulting coefficient estimates can be decomposed following McDonald and Mofitt (1980)[3] to address the separate questions of:

1) Conditional on the dependent variable (i.e., the grade) being *below* the upper limit, is a given explanatory variable, ceteris paribus, a significant determinant of the dependent variable and, if so, is the relationship positive or negative?
2) Conditional on the dependent variable value being *equal to* the upper limit, to what extent does a given explanatory variable, ceteris paribus, influence the probability that the dependent variable takes a value less than the upper limit?

Our baseline regression equation is presented as equation (1).

$$GRADE_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 DIST_{ij} + \beta_\delta Q_{ij}^k + \beta_\varphi \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{ijkt} \quad (1)$$

The subscripts i, j, k, and t denote the presenter, evaluator, question from the Presentation Evaluation Sheet, and course year, respectively, and ε is an assumed i.i.d. error term. The dependent variable series consists, as described above, of the overall presentation grades assigned to each presenting student i by each evaluating student j based on the latter's perceived quality of the former's presentation.

The $DIST_{ij}$ variable is the physical distance, measured in feet, between where the evaluating student was seated on the day of the presentation and where the student who gave the presentation chose to sit. The variable is calculated using the Pythagorean Theorem and measurements of the distances between seats within rows and across columns within the classroom. For the 2011 class, $DIST_{ij} = \sqrt{\left(\left|R_i - R_j\right| \times 4 + A \times 2.5\right)^2 + \left(\left|C_i - C_j\right| \times 3\right)^2}$, where R and C indicate, respectively, the row and column locations of student i (i.e., evaluators) and student j (i.e., presenters). Thus, $\left|R_i - R_j\right|$ and $\left|C_i - C_j\right|$ indicate the numbers of rows and columns between the students' seats, and A indicates the number of aisles separating the evaluating and presenting students' seats. The factors 4, 3 and 2.5 are the distances between rows and seats and across aisles, respectively, in the classrooms. The 2010 class met in a different classroom, and the corresponding row, aisle and column factors are 6, 3 and 4.5, respectively. The variable is literally a measure of the physical distance between students within the classroom. In accordance with our hypothesis that greater distance correlates with weaker (or non-existent) interpersonal network relationships and, hence, an expectation that lower grades will be assigned, the estimated coefficient for the distance variable is anticipated to be negative.

Casual observation found that students were largely consistent, throughout the semesters, in terms of their seat choices. The location of students on days during which student presentations were scheduled were recorded and offer some insight. Of the 42 evaluating students in the two classes, 34 chose to sit in the same seat on all presentation days. Another seven students sat in the same seat for all but one of the presentation days (i.e., they sat in a different seat only once), and a single student chose to sit in three different locations over four presentation days. In total, in 94.2 percent of the 172 cases (i.e., the sum, across the two classes, of the number of evaluating students in attendance times the number of presentation days), students chose to sit in the same locations and, when movement did occur, it was rather minimal. In fact, when students did change seats, on average, they moved 8.2 feet. It is important to note that, in both semesters, the classroom was not filled to capacity. A few empty seats were available and, as a result, there were instances where students sat away from others. This was accounted for when the distance measure was calculated.

The vector Q_{ij}^k contains nine dummy variables that indicate whether evaluating students responded favorably to each of the questions (other than the overall grade) on the Presentation Evaluation Sheet. More specifically, the dummy variables that represent the evaluators' responses to Q1 through Q3c are equal to 1 if the response was "yes" and are equal to 0 otherwise. For Q4a and Q4b, the dummy variables are equal to 1 if the response is "just right" and are equal to 0 otherwise. For Q4c, the dummy variable is equal to 1 if the response is "excellent" and is equal to 0 otherwise. Finally, given that the data were collected from two classes and there may be unobserved class-specific effects, the variable φ_t is a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the observation is from the 2011 class and is equal to 0 if the observation is from the 2010 class.

Considering the *ad hoc* nature of equation (1), we augment the baseline estimation equation to include additional explanatory variables. This serves as a robustness check of the results from the initial specification. Equation (2) illustrates.

$$GRADE_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 DIST_{ij} + \beta_\delta Q_{ij}^k + \gamma_1 CG_i + \gamma_2 CG_j + \gamma_3 D_{ij}$$

$$+\gamma_4 N_{ij} + \beta_\varphi \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{ijkt} \quad (2)$$

The variables CG_i and CG_j are measures of the percentage of total course points that had been earned by the presenting and evaluating students, respectively, at the point in the semester when the presentations were given. These values represent the cumulative performance of each student on four problem sets (20 percent of the course grade) and three examinations (60 percent of the course grade). The corresponding coefficient estimates are anticipated to be positive since a higher course grade for the presenting student potentially represents greater comprehension of the course material and a greater likelihood that the econometrics project and corresponding presentation would be of high quality and, thus, would earn a higher grade. Similarly, if a higher course grade for the evaluating student is also indicative of greater comprehension of the course material then evaluators who have performed better in the course may be better-able to understand and appreciate peer research that is higher in quality and, if so, may award higher presentation grades.

The two additional variables in equation (2), D_{ij} and N_{ij} are included to control, respectively, for the day on which the presentation takes place (within the sequence of "presentation days") and the number (i.e., order) in which the presentation occurred on that day. The logic underlying the inclusion of these variables is that, given multiple days of student presentations and several presentations given on each of these days, evaluations may vary, generally, across class sessions.[4]

Consensus is lacking among prior studies as to whether women, on average, score lower than their male counterparts in Economics courses.[5] As the relationship between gender and course performance seemingly remains an open empirical question, we choose to further augment equation (2) to include a set of interaction terms that employ dummy variables to identify whether the presenting students are male (M_i) or female (F_i) and whether they are being evaluated by a male student (M_j) or by a female student (F_j). For example, if a male presenter is evaluated by another male student then the corresponding interaction term (M_i x M_j) is equal to one. If instead, a female presenter is evaluated by a male student then the interaction term F_i x F_j is equal to one. Likewise, we control for whether the evaluating students and the presenting students are native-born (NB_i or NB_j) or are international students (I_i or I_j). The result is equation (3).

$$GRADE_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 DIST_{ij} + \beta_\delta Q_{ij}^k + \gamma_1 CG_i + \gamma_2 CG_j + \gamma_3 D_{ij} + \gamma_4 N_{ij}$$

$$+\gamma_5(I_i \times I_j) + \gamma_6(I_i \times NB_j) + \gamma_7(NB_i \times I_j) + \gamma_8(M_i \times F_j)$$

$$+\gamma_9(F_i \times F_j) + \gamma_{10}(M_i \times M_j) + \beta_\varphi \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{ijkt} \quad (3)$$

Finally, from the responses to the questions listed as Q1 through Q3c and to Q4c in Table 1, weighted scores were calculated and employed in additional estimations. The basis for employing these alternative series is to circumvent the problem that, with three or more possible choices, dummy variables indicating an evaluator response of "*yes*" incorrectly treats all other responses as equivalent. The resulting variable series avoids this problem when it is substituted for the dummy variables denoted in equation (1) by the vector Q_{ij}^k. More specifically, for Q1 through Q3c, answers of "*yes*" were assigned a weight of 2, answers of "*sort of*" were assigned a weight of 1, and answers of "*no*" were assigned a weight of zero. For Q4c, answers of "*excellent*", "*very good*", "*fair*", and "*poor*" were assigned respective weights of 3, 2, 1, and 0. For Q4a and Q4b,

evaluators again had three responses to select from; however, in each instance, two of the three responses were negative (i.e., "*too much*" and "*too little*" in the case of Q4a and "*too many*" or "*too few*" for Q4b). Thus, we retain the dichotomous dummy variables for each that equal 1 if the evaluator indicates "*just right*" and equal 0 otherwise. Effectively, this assigns a weight of 1 to a response of "*just right*" and weights of 0 to responses falling into the remaining two categories.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 1 presents the questions asked on the Presentation Evaluation Sheet and the corresponding frequencies of student responses. Column (a) reports values for the full sample, while columns (b) and (c), respectively, report values for the 2010 and 2011 classes. Column (d) reports the differences in mean values between classes and indicates whether the differences are significantly different from zero. For example, for the full sample, in 89.4 percent of cases the evaluating students were of the opinion that the student presenters provided a clear understanding of their paper topics. In the remaining 10.6 percent of cases, evaluators found presenters to only "*sort of*" provide a clear understanding of their topics. Comparing across classes, we see that students in the 2011 class were significantly more likely to answer "*yes*" and less likely to answer "*sort of*".

Focusing our discussion on the statistics for the full sample, with respect to "delivery", in 82 percent of cases the evaluating students felt that the presenter spoke clearly and in 71.5 percent of cases good eye contact was maintained. On the issue of "clarity", presentations were largely received as being logically organized (95.1 percent), containing a clear conclusion or summary (80.1 percent), and generally understandable (81.3 percent). For each of these first three categories (i.e., general understanding, delivery, and clarity), either no or only a few evaluators responded with the more negative opinion of "*no*" and instead opted for the less negative "*sort of*".

On the topic of "visual aids" we again see largely positive responses. In 83.8 percent of cases, evaluators were of the opinion that each PowerPoint slide contained the right amount of text.[6] Similarly, in 86.3 percent of cases evaluators believed the presenters used the right number of slides given the time allowed for the presentation. Finally, evaluators found the presenters' timing (as compared to the amount allowed) to be "*excellent*" in 30.8 percent of cases and "*very good*" in 49.1 percent of cases. Again, the more negative responses to "*too little text*" per slide (1.2 percent), "*too few slides*" given time allowed (6.7 percent), and "*poor*" timing (as compared to the amount allowed) (1.1 percent) were the least common responses.

Descriptive statistics for the variables of primary interest – the dependent variable series and the measure of classroom distance – are provided in Table 2. The typical presentation grade, as assigned by the peer evaluators, is equal to 8.85. Thus, according to a standard grading scale, the typical evaluator scored the typical presentation as a "B+" letter grade. While the average grade assigned by evaluators in the 2011 class is greater than the average assigned by evaluators in the 2010 class, the difference is not significant. The average distance between where the presenter and the evaluating students sat in the classrooms was equal to 13.3 feet. Mean values for the "score" variables are also included in the table. The variables included to serve as proxies for the presenters' and evaluators' general understandings of course material have mean values of 83.4 percent and 82.2 percent, respectively. In 19.6 percent of cases, an international (i.e., non-US citizen) student was evaluating another international student. Similarly, we see that native-born students evaluated international presenters 26.8 percent of the time and that international students evaluated native-born presenters 24 percent of the time. In slightly more than half of all cases (53.5 percent), male students evaluated other males, while female evaluated male presenters in 23.6 percent of cases and male students evaluated female presenters in 10.7 percent of cases.

ESTIMATION RESULTS

As noted, due to 20.3 percent of dependent variable observations being equal to the censored upper limit of 10, we employ the Tobit estimation technique. The Tobit model has an underlying structural equation of the form $y_i = \beta_X X + \varepsilon$ where the error term, ε, is assumed to be i.i.d. We can regard y_i^* as a latent variable that is observed for all dependent variable values below 10 and otherwise is censored.

In addition to the Tobit technique being appropriate given the dependent variable series, decomposition of the resulting Tobit coefficients permits the determination of the influences of the explanatory variables on both the level of the dependent variable and the likelihood that the dependent variable value is at its upper limit. Specifically, the McDonald-Moffitt decomposition recognizes that the expected value of *y* is equal to the product of the probability that the ith value of *y* is uncensored and the predicted value of *y* of those equal to 10; that is, $E(y_i^*) = P(y_i^* < 10) \times E(y_i^* | y_i^* < 10)$. Since a change in any continuous explanatory variable, χ, ceteris paribus, produces an expected change in *y* of $P(y_i^* < 10) \times \partial E(y_i^* | y_i^* < 10)/\partial\chi + E(y_i^* | y_i^* < 10) \times \partial P(y_i^* < 10)/\partial\chi$, the expected effect on *y* consists of two parts: a) the change in the expected value of y_i^* for those *y* values less than 10, weighted by the probability the *y* is less than 10, and b) the change in the probability that y_i^* is less than 10, weighted by the conditional expected value of *y*.

Tables 3a and 4a present Tobit coefficients for the estimation equations detailed above, while Tables 3b and 4b present the corresponding marginal effects.

DOES INTERPERSONAL DISTANCE CORRESPOND WITH LOWER SCORES?

Addressing the primary research question of "What relationship, if any, is there between interpersonal distance and peer evaluation scores?", we arrive at the short answer that there is a negative and significant relationship between distance and peer evaluation scores. Beginning with the results presented in Table 3a, estimation of equation (1), the baseline estimation equation, produces a coefficient estimate that is equal to -0.0135. Estimation of the augmented regression models (i.e., equations (2) and (3)) produces similar coefficient estimates: -0.0142 and -0.0111, respectively. Looking to the coefficients reported in Table 4a, we see that substitution of weighted scores for the dummy variables constructed from responses provided on the peer evaluation forms results in near-identical coefficient estimates. Likewise, the signs of the coefficient estimates and the patterns of significance are unchanged.

Interpreting the Tobit coefficient estimates as though they were obtained via application of the OLS technique, we can say that, given the functional form of the estimation equations, a one unit (i.e., one foot) increase in the physical distance between the typical evaluating and presenting student pair corresponds with a decrease of -0.082 to -0.011 in the overall grade assigned by the evaluating student. Extrapolating to consider the difference in grade, given the mean distance value (i.e., 13.26 feet), results in a lower assigned grade for the typical presenting student of 0.11 to 0.14. [7] Decomposition of the Tobit coefficients provides additional information. Marginal effects are reported in Tables 3b and 4b. Again, ceteris paribus, greater physical distance decreases the likelihood that the evaluating student will report a score of 10 (columns (g) through (i)). Specifically, if the evaluating and presenting students are usually seated the mean distance from one another, there is a 2.7 to 3.7 percent lower likelihood that the corresponding presentation score will equal 10.

Turning our attention to the remaining explanatory variables, we see that the estimated coefficients for the variables that are constructed based on the evaluating students' responses to the questions on the peer evaluation forms are positive and significant except in the cases of Q3a

and Q4b. This is taken as evidence that the questions listed on the peer evaluation form are generally in line with the overall evaluation score and are appropriate determinants of the dependent variable series. The estimated coefficients on the variables that measure the course performances of the presenting and evaluating students are also positive and significant as expected. As noted, students who perform at a higher level in the course would likely a) have more impressive research topics and more polished presentations and b) be better able to discern the overall quality of their peers' work. The estimated coefficient on the variable that indicates the order in which the presentation occurred on a given day is positive and significant. Finally, negative and significant relationships are reported for the grade and both the year 2011 dummy variable and the variable that indicates when male students are evaluating female students' presentations. Remaining coefficient estimates are not significantly different from zero.

PHYSICAL DISTANCE AND INTERPERSONAL PROXIMITY

The negative relationship between physical distance and the grades assigned by evaluating students was evident when the data collected from the 2010 course was first examined in May 2010. The intuition underlying the relationship is that students are more likely to sit near those they know relatively well or that they consider friends. Considering this intuition, during the 12^{th} week of the 2011 semester, students were asked to complete a short survey that included an alphabetical class roster and asked "Do you consider this person to be a friend, an acquaintance, an enemy or do you simply not know them well enough to categorize them along these lines?" In two-thirds of the instances, the students reported not knowing their classmate well enough to make a determination; however, 20.7 percent of responses indicated that the classmate was considered to be a friend and in 12.7 percent of cases the classmate was viewed as an acquaintance. No student identified a classmate as an enemy. Panel A of Table 5 illustrates.

The correlation coefficients indicating the relationships between evaluators' grades, physical distances and the responses to the survey questions are provided as Panel B in the table. As anticipated, given the estimation results reported in Tables 3a and 4b, there is a negative correlation between the distance and grade variables (-0.16). We also see that there are positive correlations between the grade variable and both the "*friend*" (0.11) and "*acquaintance*" dummy variables (i.e., the variables equal 1 if the evaluating student indicates the presenting student is a friend or an acquaintance, respectively, and equal 0 otherwise); however, only in the former case is the correlation coefficient significantly different from zero. Additionally, there is a negative and significant correlation (-0.12) between the "*do not know well enough to say*" variable and the grade variable. There also are significant correlations between the distance variable and the "*friend*" variable (-0.15), the "*acquaintance*" variable (-0.16), and the "*do not know…*" variable (0.23). This is taken as confirmation that students are, as anticipated, more likely to sit near those classmates they consider to be friends (or to become friends with those classmates they sit near) and to sit farther from peers that they do not know well. Further, it appears that students award higher evaluation grades to peers they consider to be friends and award lower grades to those students they do not know.

To examine these relationships in greater detail, an alternative set of regression specifications were estimated using data for only the 2011 class (since the survey was not completed by members of the 2010 class). These alternative specifications employ dummy variables to indicate whether the evaluating student considered the presenter to be a friend or an acquaintance in place of the physical distance variable. Otherwise, the specifications are identical to those for which results are presented in Tables 3a and 4b. As before, the Tobit technique is employed. Estimated coefficients are presented in Tables 6a and 7a, while marginal effects are reported in Tables 6b, 6c, 7b, and 7c.

The results are largely consistent with the findings reported earlier. As expected, the coefficient estimates for the dummy variable that indicates the evaluating student considers the presenting student to be a friend are all positive and significant. More specifically, ceteris paribus, conditional on the dependent variable being less than the censored value (i.e., columns (d) through (f)), the typical evaluating student assigns a score to the typical presenting student they consider to be a friend that is 0.21 to 0.23 higher than the score they assign to other students. Given the scale of the dependent variable series, this is equivalent to roughly a 2.2 percent increase (i.e., slightly less than a partial letter grade). Surprisingly, we find that when evaluating students consider the presenting student to be a friend the likelihood that they assign the maximum grade of 10 is reduced by 7.2 to 8.8 percent (i.e., columns (g) through (i)).

CONCLUSION

This paper presents an analysis of the relationship between physical distances, a proxy for interpersonal networks, and peer evaluation scores. Specifically, we have examined whether physical distance is an appropriate proxy variable for interpersonal networks. This has involved examination of data collected from undergraduate students enrolled in econometrics courses during the spring 2010 and spring 2011 semesters at Franklin & Marshall College. Employing the Tobit regression technique and decomposing resulting coefficient estimates into marginal effects, we find that greater physical distance is negatively related to peer evaluation scores in the sense that greater distance lowers scores and reduces the likelihood that the evaluating student will assign the maximum possible score. Similarly, evaluating students assign higher scores to those student presenters they consider friends. Somewhat unexpectedly, however, we also find that the likelihood that the maximum score possible will be assigned is lower if the evaluating student views the presenting student as a friend.

While it appears that physical distance is a quite reasonable proxy variable for interpersonal relationships/networks, it is important to note that the results are based on analysis of only two years of data. As the data is from a relatively small sample, it may not be representative of the general population and, thus, may not be generalizable. Additional research, either replicating the analysis presented here or employing alternative techniques best-suited for the data and situations available for study need to be undertaken.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B., H. Benjamin, and M.A. Fuss (1994) "The Determinants of Success in University Introductory Economics Courses", *The Journal of Economic Education* 25(2): 99-119.

Ballard, C.L. and M.F. Johnson (2004) "Basic Math Skills and Performance in an Introductory Economics Class", *The Journal of Economic Education* 35(4): 3-23.

Borg, M.O. and H.A. Stranahan (2002) "Personality Type and Student Performance in Upper-Level Economics Courses: The Importance of Race and Gender", *The Journal of Economic Education* 33(1): 3-14.

Ferber, M.A., B.G. Birnbaum, and C.A. Green (1983) "Gender Differences in Economic Knowledge: A Reevaluation of the Evidence", *The Journal of Economic Education* 14(2): 24-37.

Ghorpade, J. and J.R. Lackritz (2001) "Peer Evaluation in the Classroom: A Check for Sex and Race/Ethnicity Effects", *The Journal of Education for Business* 76 (5): 274-281.

Gohmann, S. and L.C. Spector (1989) "Test Scrambling and Student Performance", *The Journal of Economic Education* 20(3): 235-38.

Greene, L.L. (1989) "An Economic Analysis of Student Loan Default", *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 11 (1): 61-68.

Hall, E.T. (1969) The Hidden Dimension, Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hirschfeld, M., R.L. Moore, and E. Brown (1995) "Exploring the Gender Gap on the GRE Subject Test in Economics", *The Journal of Economic Education* 26(1): 3-15.

Krohn, G. and C. O'Connor (2005) "Student Effort and Performance over the Semester", *The Journal of Economic Education* 36(4): 3-28.

Lumsden, K.G. and A. Scott (1987) "The Economics Student Reexamined: Male-female Differences in Comprehension", *The Journal of Economic Education* 18(4): 365-75.

McDonald, J.F. and R.A. Moffit (1980) "The Uses of Tobit Analysis", *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 62 (2): 318-321.

Roncek, D.W. (1992) "Learning More from Tobit Coefficients: Extending a Comparative Analysis of Political Protest", *American Sociological Review* 57 (4): 503-507.

Siegfried, J.J. (1979) "Male-female Differences in Economic Education: A Survey", *The Journal of Economic Education* 10(2): 1-11.

Strober, M.H., A. Cook, and K.A. Fuller (1997) "Making and Correcting Errors in Student Economic Analyses: An Examination of Videotapes", *The Journal of Economic Education* 28(3): 255-71.

Swope, K.J. and P.M. Schmitt (2006) "The Performance of Economics Graduates over the

Entire Curriculum: The Determinants of Success", *The Journal of Economic Education* 37(4): 387-94.

Watts, M. and G.J. Lynch (1989) "The Principles Course Revisited", *American Economic Review* 79(2): 236-41.

ENDNOTES

[1] The syllabus for the spring 2011 course is provided as Appendix A.

[2] The peer evaluation form (i.e., the Presentation Evaluation Sheet) is provided as Appendix B.

[3] See Greene (1989) and Roncek (1992) for examples of the McDonald-Moffit decomposition procedure.

[4] To discourage absences, students were informed of the following when the presentation schedule was distributed: "1. You have an obligation to your peers to be present and engaged during their presentations. 2. Absences will be noted each day that presentations occur. 3. Each unexcused absence during the presentation days will result in a partial letter grade reduction in your final course grade. For example, one absence will lower a B+ to a B, two absences will lower a B+ to a B-, three absences will lower a B+ to a C+ and four absences will lower a B+ to a C." Over the two course offerings, only one student suffered a grade reduction and that was for a single absence. In other words, evaluating cohorts changed minimally during each semester.

[5] Swope and Schmitt (2006), Borg and Stranahan (2002), Ghorpade and Lackritz (2001), and Strober et al. (1997) all report no significant difference across genders with respect to course performances. However, a number of studies (e.g., Krohn and O'Connor (2005), Ballard and Johnson (2004), Anderson et al. (1994), Gohmann and Spector (1989), Watts and Lynch (1989), Lumsden and Scott (1987), Ferber et al. (1983), and Siegfried (1979)) report that women score lower than men in Economics courses. Similarly, Hirschfeld et al. (1995) note that women generally score lower than do men on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) subject test in economics.

[6] Students were not required to use PowerPoint; however, all chose to do so.

[7] Estimating the specifications for which results are reported in Tables 3 and 4 using the OLS technique produces coefficient estimates that are of the same signs and that are significantly different from zero at the same levels; however, the OLS coefficient values are uniformly greater in value – from as little as 2.78 percent to 11.27 percent – than the Tobit coefficients.

[8] Other than changes to i) class meeting times (MW 1:00-2:20pm for the spring 2010 semester and MWF 10:00-10:50am for the spring 2011 semester), ii) office hours (M 3:00-5:00pm, T 2:30-4:30pm and by appointment during the spring 2010 semester and M 1:30-3:30pm, W 2:30-4:30pm, and by appointment during the spring 2011 semester), and iii) the class meeting dates listed in the course calendar, the course syllabi did not significantly differ across the two semesters.

[9] An additional four students presented their research to the spring 2010 class; however, these students had not chosen titles for their research papers at the time of the presentations. Thus, only 15 of the 19 spring 2010 paper titles are listed here.

APPENDIX A: Course Syllabus[6]

ECO 310 Introduction to Econometrics
Spring 2011

Franklin & Marshall College
Department of Economics

Dr. Roger White
Office: Stager Hall 333
Phone: 717-291-3920
Lectures: MWF 10:00-10:50am, Stager Hall 114

roger.white@fandm.edu
http://edisk.fandm.edu/roger.white
OH: M 1:30-3:30pm, W 2:30-4:30pm, and by appointment

Syllabus

I. Course Description/Overview: (From the F&M course catalog) An introduction to the statistical analysis of economic data, with a balance of theory, applications and original research. The Classical Linear Regression Model is covered in detail along with typical departures from its assumptions including heteroskedasticity, serial correlation and non-stationarity. Further subjects can include instrumental variables, limited dependent variables and advanced time-series topics, depending on time and student interest. Prerequisites: ECO100, ECO103 and either ECO210 or MAT216.

(A more precise description/overview) This course offers an introduction to econometrics. We begin with the "basics" – the Classic Linear Regression Model and its assumptions (i.e., the classical assumptions). In learning the Classical model, we develop an understanding of basic regression analysis which includes testing for fulfillment of the classical assumptions and what corrections may be applied if/when they are not fulfilled. We close the semester emphasizing probability models with dichotomous dependent variables (e.g., linear probability models, logits, probits) and by introducing the Tobit procedure. Emphasis will be on tools and the procedures applicable to cross-sectional and panel data analysis. Time constraints being as they are, we will not explore more advanced panel/cross-sectional techniques or time-series analysis. This is an introductory course and econometrics is far too broad an area of study to cover more than the basics in a single semester.

Should you find that, at the semester's end, you wish to learn additional techniques, I suggest you seek out faculty members who are competent in econometric analysis and inquire about the likelihood that you pursue an independent study project – perhaps, even an Honors Thesis – under their supervision.

II. Textbook: There is one required textbook for this class. It is available at the campus bookstore.

Studenmund, A.H. 2006. Using Econometrics: A Practical Guide, 5th edition, Pearson – Addison Wesley: Boston et al.

Additional readings (listed below) are posted to Blackboard: http://blackboard.fandm.edu

a. Greene, L.L. (1989) An Economic Analysis of Student Loan Default. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11 (1), 61-68.
b. McDonald, J.F. & R.A. Moffit. (1980) The Uses of Tobit Analysis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 62 (2), 318-321.
c. Pampel, Fred C. (2000) *Logistic Regression – A Primer*, Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-132. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

d. Roncek, D.W. (1992) Learning More from Tobit Coefficients: Extending a Comparative Analysis of Political Protest. *American Sociological Review*, 57 (4), 503-507.

Stata-related resources that may prove useful for you during the semester:

1. UCLA's Academic Technology Services website: www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/
2. Google. Seriously. Stata is so widely used (it is the most commonly-used econometrics software in the world) that Google searches often turn-up exactly what one is looking for. To give you an idea, a Google search of the word 'Stata' returns 31.7 million hits.
3. ShadFack. A few years ago, I used the College's money to order a number of Stata publications. A search of the F&M library catalog turns up 10 Stata books – 6 of which are currently available. These are sitting at ShadFack for you to access.
4. Three sets of Stata manuals (versions 6, 7 and 8) sit above the faculty mailboxes in STA322. If you use these manuals, please be kind to them and be sure to return them to their proper locations. Your peers and those who take ECO210 and/or ECO310 in the future may access these manuals.

Additionally, a listing (or links) to possible data sources is included on the course Blackboard site.

You are expected to complete assigned readings prior to lecture. Waiting until a just prior to an exam date to attempt the readings is, at best, a poor strategy and, most likely, will lead to a grade that significantly understates your abilities. Plan to devote substantial time to this course.

III. Grading:

Your grade will be determined based on a cumulative score derived using the following weights:

1. Problem sets = 20 points (4 problem sets, each = 5 points);
2. Econometrics project = 20 points (presentation = 5 points; final version of project = 15 points);
3. Examinations 60 points (#1 = 15 points; #2 = 20 points; #3 = 25 points).

Problem Sets: Problem sets are designed to reinforce course material and to prepare you for examinations. You are permitted/encouraged to work collectively on these assignments. To that end, you may work in groups of up to three students and submit a single assignment with all associated names listed. Be sure not to "free-ride" on others' efforts, as I often recycle questions from problem sets when constructing exams.

Econometrics Presentation/Project: You will choose a subject and complete an econometrics project during the semester. All topics must be approved by me and I expect projects of considerable quality and complexity. Failure to submit an acceptable proposal will result in zero points being recorded for the final paper and for the presentation. Relevant dates are included in the course calendar.

Examinations: Exams will consist of a theory portion and an applications portion. Each will emphasize material covered since the preceding exam; however, the second and third exams will be cumulative. A week prior to each exam, I will circulate a set of review questions and inform you of the exam format.

Late assignments will only be accepted if you can provide a verifiable medical excuse. Likewise, make-up examinations and quizzes will only be given if you can provide a verifiable medical excuse. Under such circumstances, contact me as early as possible to discuss

possible alternative arrangements should it be impossible for you to meet a due date. Note that the burden of verification rests entirely on the shoulders of the student. Neither travel plans nor athletic events are acceptable reasons for exceptions.

To merit a passing grade, you must meet the following three criteria:

i. You must earn an average score of 65 percent on both the theory portions and the application portions of three midterm examinations.

ii. When you submit the final version of your econometrics project, you must provide on CD
   a. the final version of your paper,
   b. a data file in Stata 10 format,
   c. the "do" file, in text format, used to produce the results presented in your paper,
   d. the log file that results when your "do" file is run using the submitted data file.

iii. I must be able to load the data file, execute the "do" file, generate a log file identical to the log you submit and the results presented in the paper must match those in the log file.

Precision, accuracy, and the ability for me to replicate your results matter a great deal. **If any of these criteria are not fulfilled, I will have no choice but to assign you a failing grade for the course.** If you doubt your ability to meet these obligations, I suggest that you reconsider taking this course.

IV. Active Participation: Your participation during lectures is expected. As it is difficult, if not impossible, for me to accurately grade participation either in terms of frequency or quality, I will not allocate any portion of the course grade to participation. I may, however, award credit when determining final grades if I feel that a students' participation merits an increase in her/his course grade. Please note that attendance does not equate to participation. Attendance is a prerequisite to participation. I expect you will arrive to each lecture, having completed the assigned reading(s), fully prepared to take notes and to ask questions and contribute to the lecture. I understand if you are shy. (I am shy myself.) However, the net benefits of overcoming shyness more than outweigh the costs of trying to remain anonymous.

V. Attendance: Lecture attendance is expected. This course provides treatments of topics which may be, at times, quite complicated. Regular attendance and participation will increase your understanding of course material.

VI. Academic Honesty: Nothing less than exemplary behavior with respect to academic honesty is expected. I consider any deviance from such behavior to be a serious matter. As such, any and all instances of suspected academic dishonesty will be referred to the Office of the Dean. Plagiarism is defined by F&M as follows: Transitive senses: to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own; to use (another's production) without crediting the source. Intransitive senses: to commit literary theft; to present as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source (http://library.fandm.edu/plagiarism.html).

VII. Miscellaneous Issues:

- Please do not arrive late to lecture. Similarly, if you must leave the classroom for any reason prior to the end of lecture, please do so as quietly as possible.

- Cell phones and other electronic devices are to be turned off during lectures and examinations. In the event that a student is caught texting during class, I will cancel the remainder of lecture for that day and the student will receive a one letter grade reduction in her/his final course grade (for each incident).
- Buy a small, non-graphing, basic function calculator that lacks the ability to store information for use during the theory portion of exams. Use of graphing calculators, cell phones, etc will not be permitted. If you are unsure if your calculator is acceptable, see me in advance of the first exam.

At some point during the semester I expect most (if not all) students to become confused. While this is an introductory course, you would be mistaken to consider "introductory" as synonymous with "easy." Keeping this in mind, if you begin to lag behind the class, feel overwhelmed by the material, need additional explanations beyond what I provide as part of the lectures, or need to see me for any reason, please do not hesitate to do so. My office hours are pre-arranged opportunities for you to meet with me. Should scheduled office hours prove incompatible with your schedule, please send me an email or call or talk to me before or after lecture to arrange an alternative meeting time.

VIII. Course Calendar (Tentative)

Date	Topic	Assignments/Due Dates
	Part 1: The Basic Regression Model	
Week 1:		
1/19-21	Introduction (Ch. 16)	**(1/19) PS1 assigned**
Week 2:		
1/24-28	An Overview of Regression Analysis (Ch. 1); Stata basics	
Week 3:		
1/31-2/4	Ordinary Least Squares (Ch. 2); Learning to Use Regression Analysis (Ch. 3)	**(2/2) PS1 due; PS2 assigned**
Week 4:		
2/7-11	The Classical Model (Ch. 4)	
Week 5:		
2/14-18	The Classical Model (Ch. 4) Hypothesis Testing (Ch. 5)	**(2/16) PS2 due;** **(2/16) Exam review questions/format posted;** **(2/18) Project approval deadline #1**
Week 6:		
2/21-23	*First Midterm Examination*	

Part 2: Violations of the Classical Assumptions

Week 6 (cont.):		
2/25	Specification: Choosing the Independent Variables (Ch. 6)	**(2/25) PS3 assigned**
Week 7:		
2/28-3/4	Choosing a functional form (Ch. 7) Multicollinearity (Ch. 8)	**(2/28) Project topic deadline #2; (3/2) PS3 due; (3/2) PS4 assigned**
Week 8:		
3/7-11	Serial Correlation (Ch. 9) Heteroskedasticity (Ch. 10)	**(3/9) PS4 due;** **(3/9) Exam review questions/format posted**
Week 9:		
3/14-18	*Spring Break*	
Week 11:		
3/21	Correcting for Violations of the Classical Assumptions (Ch. 7-10)	
3/23-25	*Second Midterm Examination*	

Part 3: Some Extensions of Basic Regression Techniques

Week 11:		
3/28-4/1	Linear Probability Models, Probits and Logits (Part 1) (Ch. 13 and Pampel, 2000)	
Week 12:		
4/4-8	Linear Probability Models, Probits and Logits (Part 2) Tobits (Part 1) (Greene, 1989; McDonald and Moffitt, 1980; and Roncek, 1992)	**(4/6) Paper "drafts" due;** **(4/6) Exam review questions/format posted**
Week 13:		
4/11	Tobits (Part 2)	
4/13-15	*Third Midterm Examination*	
Weeks 14-15:		
4/18-27	Econometrics Project Presentations: Students will present their project findings to the class.	
5/4	*Due date for final versions of econometric projects: 4:30pm.*	

APPENDIX B: Peer Evaluation Form

Presentation Evaluation Sheet

Evaluator _____
Presenter _____

1. **Do you feel that the presenter is giving you a clear understanding of what her/his paper is about? (circle one)**

   YES NO SORT OF

2. **Delivery:**

   Clearly Spoken? _____ (yes, no, sort of)

   Maintains good eye contact? _____ (yes, no, sort of)

3. **Clarity:**

   Presentation logically organized? _____ (yes, no, sort of)

   Clear conclusion or summary? _____ (yes, no, sort of)

   Understandable from a general technical viewpoint? _____ (yes, no, sort of)

4. **Visual Aids:**

   Amount of text per slide? _____(too much, too little, just right)

   Number of slides for time allotment? _____ (too many, too few, just right)

   Timing (given allotted time)? _____ (excellent, very good, fair, poor)

Overall Grade (on a 1-10 scale with 10 as the highest): _____

*** Please use back of this sheet for any additional comments or compliments ***

APPENDIX C: List of Titles for Students' Econometrics Projects

Spring 2010 Class[9]

"An Econometric Analysis of Money Demand in the World, 1980-2007"
"Performance Analysis of Airlines using Regression Analysis"
"Indicators of Profitability and their Impact on Stock Prices"
"The Stock Market – Its Reaction to the Core Financial Capabilities of Companies"
"US Imports: How Quantity of Imports Responds to Industry and Industry Prices"
"Do We Live in a Global Economy?"
"An Econometric Evaluation of Economic Growth Models"
"Retail Bank Branch Office Location Decisions in Lancaster County, PA"
"The Effect of Smoking, Labor Force Participation, Poverty and Income on Mortality Rates in the Over-65 Population"
"Project: Employment Discrimination against Foreigners and Immigrants"
"Effects of Residential Segregation on the Black-White Wage Gap"
"The Urban Wage Premium: An Analysis of Factors That Make Urban Residents Earn More than Rural Residents"
"Secondary Market Pricing: A Case Study on 'Magic: The Gathering' Trading Cards"
"A Comparison of the Cost Effectiveness of MLB Pitching Staffs"
"Salary Determination of NHL Goalies Based on Skill Statistics and Discrimination"

Spring 2011 Class

"Emissions and Development: Examining the Environmental Kuznets Curve with respect to CO2 and SO2 Emissions"
"FDI as a Determinant of Trade: A Gravity Model Specification"
"National Basketball Association Season Average Attendance of Each Club: What Determines It and How"
"Determinants of Pay in the National Hockey League: Examining the Existence of Discrimination of Canadian-born Players"
"Major League Baseball Revenue and Player Performance"
"The Components of a Strikeout and Predicted Pitcher Salaries"
"Predicting Baseball Salaries: New vs. Old Statistics"
"Quantity Theory of Money and the China Paradox"
"Different Factors that Affects China's GDP per Capita in 2003 and 2008"
"Testing the Solow Growth Model: Empirical Evidence of Convergence in Transition Countries"
"Poverty Rate Regression Analysis"
"How Does the Stock Market Respond to the Change in the Target Federal Funds Rate"
"Study on Self-Employment of the United States"
"An Analysis of Pennsylvania School District's Transportation Costs from 1986 to 2008"
"GLS Regression Analysis of Vehicle Power and Fuel Economy"
"US Top 100 National University Housing Cost"

Table 1: Response Frequencies

Question	Response	Full sample N = 568 (a)	2010 class N = 274 (b)	2011 class N = 294 (c)	2010-2011 difference (d)
Q1. Do you feel that the presenter is giving you a clear understanding of what her/his paper is about?	*Yes*	0.8944	0.8613	0.9252	0.0639**
		(0.3076)	(0.3463)	(0.2636)	
	Sort of	0.1056	0.1387	0.0748	-0.0639**
		(0.3076)	(0.3463)	(0.2636)	
	No	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
		(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	
Q2a. Delivery: Clearly spoken?	*Yes*	0.8204	0.7920	0.8469	0.0549*
		(0.3842)	(0.4066)	(0.3607)	
	Sort of	0.1708	0.1934	0.1497	-0.0437
		(0.3766)	(0.3957)	(0.3573)	
	No	0.0088	0.0146	0.0034	-0.0112
		(0.0935)	(0.1202)	(0.0583)	
Q2b. Delivery: Maintains good eye contact?	*Yes*	0.7148	0.6642	0.7619	0.0977***
		(0.4519)	(0.4731)	(0.4266)	
	Sort of	0.2535	0.2956	0.2143	-0.0813**
		(0.4354)	(0.4572)	(0.411)	
	No	0.0317	0.0401	0.0238	-0.0163
		(0.1753)	(0.1967)	(0.1527)	
Q3a. Clarity: Presentation logically organized?	*Yes*	0.9507	0.9343	0.9660	0.0317*
		(0.2167)	(0.2482)	(0.1816)	
	Sort of	0.0493	0.0657	0.0340	-0.0317*
		(0.2167)	(0.2482)	(0.1816)	
	No	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
		(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	
Q3b. Clarity: Clear conclusion or summary?	*Yes*	0.8011	0.7993	0.8027	0.0034
		(0.3996)	(0.4013)	(0.3986)	
	Sort of	0.1954	0.1971	0.1939	-0.0032
		(0.3969)	(0.3985)	(0.396)	
	No	0.0035	0.0036	0.0034	-0.0002
		(0.0593)	(0.0604)	(0.0583)	
Q3c. Clarity: Understandable from a general technical viewpoint?	*Yes*	0.8134	0.8175	0.8095	-0.0080
		(0.3899)	(0.3869)	(0.3933)	
	Sort of	0.1849	0.1788	0.1905	0.0117
		(0.3885)	(0.3839)	(0.3933)	
	No	0.0018	0.0036	0.0000	-0.0036
		(0.042)	(0.0604)	(0.0000)	
Q4a. Visual Aids: Amount of text per slide?	*Just right*	0.8380	0.7810	0.8912	0.1102***
		(0.3687)	(0.4143)	(0.312)	
	Too much	0.1496	0.2044	0.0986	-0.1058***
		(0.357)	(0.404)	(0.2987)	
	Too little	0.0123	0.0146	0.0102	-0.0044
		(0.1104)	(0.1202)	(0.1007)	

Table 1: Response Frequencies (continued)

Question	Response	Full sample N = 568 (a)	2010 class N = 274 (b)	2011 class N = 294 (c)	2010-2011 difference (d)
Q4b. Visual Aids: Number of slides for time allotment?	*Just right*	0.8627	0.8175	0.9048	0.0873***
		(0.3445)	(0.3869)	(0.294)	
	Too many	0.0704	0.1131	0.0306	-0.0825***
		(0.2561)	(0.3173)	(0.1726)	
	Too few	0.0669	0.0693	0.0646	-0.0047
		(0.2501)	(0.2545)	(0.2463)	
Q4c. Visual Aids: Timing (compared with allotted time)?	*Excellent*	0.3081	0.1752	0.4320	0.2568***
		(0.4621)	(0.3808)	(0.4962)	
	Very good	0.4912	0.5766	0.4116	-0.1650***
		(0.5004)	(0.495)	(0.493)	
	Fair	0.1901	0.2336	0.1497	-0.0839**
		(0.3928)	(0.4239)	(0.3573)	
	Poor	0.0106	0.0146	0.0068	-0.0078
		(0.1023)	(0.1202)	(0.0823)	

Standard deviations in parentheses. "***", "**", and "*" denote statistical significance, with respect to the differences in mean values between 2010 and 2011, at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Description	Full sample N = 568 (a)	2010 class N = 274 (b)	2011 class N = 294 (c)	2010-2011 difference (d)
$GRADE_{ij}$	*Grade (1 to 10)*	8.8520	8.7987	8.9017	0.103
		(0.8858)	(0.9105)	(0.8607)	
$DIST_{ij}$	*Distance (seated, in feet)*	13.2641	14.3723	12.2313	-2.141***
		(6.9488)	(7.5197)	(6.2077)	
..	*Q1 score (weighted)*	1.8944	1.8613	1.9252	0.0639**
		(0.3076)	(0.3463)	(0.2636)	
..	*Q2a score (weighted)*	1.8116	1.7774	1.8435	0.0661*
		(0.4133)	(0.4506)	(0.3732)	
..	*Q2b score (weighted)*	1.6831	1.6241	1.7381	0.114**
		(0.5295)	(0.5622)	(0.4917)	
..	*Q3a score (weighted)*	1.9507	1.9343	1.9660	0.0317*
		(0.2167)	(0.2482)	(0.1816)	
..	*Q3b score (weighted)*	1.7975	1.7956	1.7993	0.0037
		(0.4109)	(0.4130)	(0.4096)	
..	*Q3c score (weighted)*	1.8116	1.8139	1.8095	-0.0044
		(0.3958)	(0.3992)	(0.3933)	
..	*Q4c score (weighted)*	2.0968	1.9124	2.2687	0.3563***
		(0.7294)	(0.6791)	(0.7338)	
I_j x I_i	*International evaluated by international*	0.1937	0.1679	0.2177	0.0498
		(0.3955)	(0.3744)	(0.4134)	
I_j x NB_i	*International evaluated by native-born*	0.2694	0.2555	0.2823	0.0268
		(0.4440)	(0.4369)	(0.4509)	
NB_j x I_i	*Native-born evaluated by international*	0.2412	0.2445	0.2381	-0.0064
		(0.4282)	(0.4306)	(0.4266)	
NB_j x NB_i	*Native-born evaluated by native-born*	0.2958	0.3321	0.2619	-0.0702*
		(0.4568)	(0.4718)	(0.4404)	
M_j x M_i	*Male evaluated by male*	0.5352	0.5876	0.4864	-0.1012**
		(0.4992)	(0.4932)	(0.5007)	
M_j x F_i	*Male evaluated by female*	0.2377	0.1971	0.2755	0.0784**
		(0.4260)	(0.3985)	(0.4475)	
F_j x M_i	*Female evaluated by male*	0.1690	0.1715	0.1667	-0.0048
		(0.3751)	(0.3777)	(0.3733)	
F_j x F_i	*Female evaluated by female*	0.0581	0.0438	0.0714	0.0276
		(0.2341)	(0.2050)	(0.2580)	
CG_j	*Presenter's course score (0 to 1)*	0.8342	0.8397	0.8290	-0.0107
		(0.0917)	(0.0863)	(0.0964)	
CG_i	*Evaluator's course score (0 to 1)*	0.8223	0.8381	0.8077	-0.0304***
		(0.0930)	(0.0919)	(0.0918)	

See Table 1 notes.

Table 3a: Tobit Coefficients, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10)

Specification:	(1)	(2)	(3)
Variable:	(a)	(b)	(c)
Distance (seated)	-0.0135***	-0.0142***	-0.0111*
	(0.0048)	(0.0047)	(0.0057)
Q1: "Yes"	0.5363***	0.5509***	0.5293***
	(0.1188)	(0.1167)	(0.1162)
Q2a: "Yes"	0.5933***	0.5718***	0.6054***
	(0.0913)	(0.0917)	(0.0925)
Q2b: "Yes"	0.3672***	0.368***	0.3776***
	(0.077)	(0.0758)	(0.0752)
Q3a: "Yes"	0.0131	0.0152	-0.0159
	(0.1669)	(0.1638)	(0.1628)
Q3b: "Yes"	0.4804***	0.4694***	0.473***
	(0.0847)	(0.0841)	(0.0835)
Q3c: "Yes"	0.4103***	0.3964***	0.426***
	(0.0924)	(0.0918)	(0.0915)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.4199***	0.4244***	0.3788***
	(0.0896)	(0.0896)	(0.0904)
Q4b: "Just right"	0.0268	0.0163	0.0175
	(0.0962)	(0.0952)	(0.0947)
Q4c: "Excellent"	0.6403***	0.5996***	0.5558***
	(0.0772)	(0.0767)	(0.077)
Presenter's course grade		1.4146***	1.5053***
		(0.4002)	(0.4108)
Evaluator's course grade		0.7775**	0.6476*
		(0.3573)	(0.3587)
Presentation day		-0.0184	-0.0104
		(0.0297)	(0.0317)
Presentation number		0.0583*	0.0505*
		(0.0299)	(0.0302)
International evaluating international			-0.0065
			(0.1029)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.0665
			(0.1024)
International evaluating native-born			-0.0184
			(0.1015)
Female evaluating male			0.019
			(0.1603)
Male evaluating female			-0.2944*
			(0.1567)
Male evaluating male			-0.2372
			(0.1529)
Year 2011 dummy variable	-0.2261***	-0.1427**	-0.1585**
	(0.0703)	(0.0726)	(0.0732)
Constant	6.7135***	4.7957***	5.0277***
	(0.1875)	(0.5266)	(0.5761)

N = 568 for all estimations. Standard errors in parentheses. "***", "**" and "*" denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 3b: Tobit Marginal Effects, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10)

	Conditional on being Uncensored			*Probability Uncensored*		
Specification:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Variable:	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Distance	-0.01***	-0.0107***	-0.0084*	-0.0027***	-0.0028***	-0.0021*
(seated)	(0.0036)	(0.0036)	(0.0043)	(0.001)	(0.0009)	(0.0011)
Q1: "Yes"	0.4363***	0.4538***	0.4372***	-0.0725***	-0.071***	-0.0679***
	(0.0884)	(0.0878)	(0.088)	(0.0238)	(0.0229)	(0.0225)
Q2a: "Yes"	0.4782***	0.4647***	0.4965***	-0.0846***	-0.0797***	-0.0813***
	(0.0679)	(0.069)	(0.07)	(0.0183)	(0.018)	(0.0179)
Q2b: "Yes"	0.283***	0.2869***	0.2964***	-0.0641***	-0.0624***	-0.0629***
	(0.0572)	(0.057)	(0.0569)	(0.0154)	(0.0149)	(0.0146)
Q3a: "Yes"	0.0098	0.0115	-0.012	-0.0026	-0.0029	0.0031
	(0.1241)	(0.1232)	(0.1232)	(0.0335)	(0.0321)	(0.0316)
Q3b: "Yes"	0.3807***	0.3755***	0.3808***	-0.0742***	-0.0706***	-0.0698***
	(0.063)	(0.0632)	(0.0632)	(0.017)	(0.0165)	(0.0162)
Q3c: "Yes"	0.3231***	0.3152***	0.3419***	-0.0651***	-0.0614***	-0.0638***
	(0.0687)	(0.0691)	(0.0692)	(0.0185)	(0.018)	(0.0177)
Q4a: "Just	0.3326***	0.3401***	0.3035***	-0.0648***	-0.0633***	-0.0571***
right"	(0.0667)	(0.0674)	(0.0684)	(0.018)	(0.0176)	(0.0175)
Q4b: "Just	0.02	0.0123	0.0133	-0.0053	-0.0032	-0.0034
right"	(0.0715)	(0.0716)	(0.0717)	(0.0193)	(0.0187)	(0.0184)
Q4c:	0.4454***	0.4236***	0.3969***	-0.1613***	-0.1473***	-0.1337***
"Excellent"	(0.0574)	(0.0577)	(0.0582)	(0.0155)	(0.015)	(0.0149)
Presenter's		1.064***	1.1392***		0.2774***	0.2918***
course grade		(0.301)	(0.3109)		(0.0785)	(0.0796)
Evaluator's		0.5848**	0.4901*		0.1524**	0.1255*
course grade		(0.2688)	(0.2715)		(0.0701)	(0.0695)
Presentation day		-0.0138	-0.0078		-0.0036	-0.002
		(0.0224)	(0.024)		(0.0058)	(0.0061)
Presentation		0.0439*	0.0382*		0.0114*	0.0098*
number		(0.0255)	(0.0229)		(0.0059)	(0.0059)
Int'l evaluating			-0.0049			0.0013
international			(0.0779)			(0.0199)
Native-born			-0.0507			0.0125
evaluating int'l			(0.0775)			(0.0198)
Int'l evaluating			-0.014			0.0035
native-born			(0.0768)			(0.0197)
Female evaluating			0.0143			-0.0037
male			(0.1213)			(0.0311)
Male evaluating			-0.2329**			0.0471
female			(0.1186)			(0.0304)
Male evaluating			-0.1787			0.047
male			(0.1157)			(0.0296)
Year 2011	-0.1678***	-0.1072**	-0.1197**	0.0458***	0.0282**	0.031**
dummy	(0.0523)	(0.0546)	(0.0554)	(0.0141)	(0.0142)	(0.0142)
Constant	4.9923***	3.6071***	3.8047***	1.3463***	0.9403***	0.9745***
	(0.1394)	(0.3961)	(0.436)	(0.0376)	(0.1033)	(0.1117)

See Table 3a notes.

Table 4a: Tobit Coefficients, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10)

Specification:	IV	V	VI
Variable:	(a)	(b)	(c)
Distance (seated)	-0.0126***	-0.0133***	-0.0108*
	(0.0047)	(0.0046)	(0.0056)
Q1 score	0.4803***	0.4946***	0.4841***
	(0.1168)	(0.1155)	(0.115)
Q2a score	0.5158***	0.4979***	0.5246***
	(0.0848)	(0.0857)	(0.0868)
Q2b score	0.2975***	0.3072***	0.3214***
	(0.066)	(0.0653)	(0.0649)
Q3a score	-0.0678	-0.0569	-0.0681
	(0.1639)	(0.1619)	(0.1609)
Q3b score	0.4164***	0.4141***	0.4198***
	(0.0813)	(0.0814)	(0.0808)
Q3c score	0.4352***	0.4227***	0.4472***
	(0.0891)	(0.0891)	(0.0888)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.448***	0.4474***	0.3955***
	(0.0879)	(0.0885)	(0.0894)
Q4b: "Just right"	-0.0857	-0.0826	-0.0699
	(0.096)	(0.0956)	(0.095)
Q4c score	0.4545***	0.4145***	0.3861***
	(0.0482)	(0.0489)	(0.0496)
Presenter's course grade		1.1921***	1.3303***
		(0.3957)	(0.406)
Evaluator's course grade		0.6413*	0.5007
		(0.3539)	(0.356)
Presentation day		-0.0137	-0.0025
		(0.0293)	(0.0313)
Presentation number		0.0469	0.0403
		(0.0295)	(0.0297)
International evaluating international			0.0582
			(0.1016)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.0478
			(0.1009)
International evaluating native-born			0.0281
			(0.1)
Female evaluating male			0.0374
			(0.1576)
Male evaluating female			-0.2628*
			(0.1544)
Male evaluating male			-0.1768
			(0.151)
Year 2011 dummy variable	-0.2093***	-0.1372*	-0.1568**
	(0.0677)	(0.0709)	(0.0716)
Constant	4.217***	2.6556***	2.7536***
	(0.3226)	(0.5713)	(0.623)
Pseudo R^2	0.2325	0.2417	0.2496

See Table 3a notes.

Table 4b: Tobit Marginal Effects, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10)

	Conditional on being Uncensored			*Probability Uncensored*		
Specification:	IV	V	VI	IV	V	VI
Variable:	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Distance (seated)	-0.0095***	-0.0101***	-0.0082*	-0.0024***	-0.0025***	-0.002*
	(0.0035)	(0.0035)	(0.0043)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0011)
Q1 score	0.362***	0.3758***	0.37***	0.0935***	0.0946***	0.0914***
	(0.088)	(0.0877)	(0.0879)	(0.0227)	(0.0221)	(0.0217)
Q2a score	0.3888***	0.3783***	0.401***	0.1004***	0.0952***	0.0991***
	(0.0639)	(0.0651)	(0.0664)	(0.0165)	(0.0164)	(0.0164)
Q2b score	0.2243***	0.2334***	0.2456***	0.0579***	0.0588***	0.0607***
	(0.0498)	(0.0496)	(0.0496)	(0.0129)	(0.0125)	(0.0123)
Q3a score	-0.0511	-0.0432	-0.052	-0.0132	-0.0109	-0.0129
	(0.1236)	(0.123)	(0.123)	(0.0319)	(0.031)	(0.0304)
Q3b score	0.3138***	0.3146***	0.3209***	0.081***	0.0792***	0.0793***
	(0.0613)	(0.0618)	(0.0618)	(0.0158)	(0.0156)	(0.0153)
Q3c score	0.328***	0.3212***	0.3418***	0.0847***	0.0809***	0.0845***
	(0.0671)	(0.0677)	(0.0679)	(0.0173)	(0.017)	(0.0168)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.3607***	0.3629***	0.3205***	-0.0653***	-0.0636***	-0.057***
	(0.0663)	(0.0672)	(0.0683)	(0.0171)	(0.0169)	(0.0169)
Q4b: "Just right"	-0.0636	-0.0618	-0.0527	0.0177	0.0168	0.0139
	(0.0724)	(0.0726)	(0.0726)	(0.0187)	(0.0183)	(0.0179)
Q4c score	0.3426***	0.3149***	0.2952***	0.0885***	0.0793***	0.0729***
	(0.0364)	(0.0372)	(0.0379)	(0.0094)	(0.0094)	(0.0094)
Presenter's		0.9057***	1.0168***		0.2281***	0.2512***
course grade		(0.3007)	(0.3103)		(0.0757)	(0.0767)
Evaluator's		0.4872*	0.3827		0.1227*	0.0945
course grade		(0.2689)	(0.2721)		(0.0677)	(0.0672)
Presentation day		-0.0104	-0.0019		-0.0026	-0.0005
		(0.0223)	(0.0239)		(0.0056)	(0.0059)
Presentation		0.0357	0.0308		0.009	0.0076
number		(0.0224)	(0.0227)		(0.0056)	(0.0056)
International			0.0441			-0.0114
evaluating int'l			(0.0777)			(0.0192)
Native-born			-0.0367			0.0088
evaluating int'l			(0.0771)			(0.019)
Int'l evaluating			0.0214			-0.0054
native-born			(0.0764)			(0.0189)
Female evaluating			0.0285			-0.0072
male			(0.1204)			(0.0298)
Male evaluating			-0.209*			0.0416
female			(0.118)			(0.0292)
Male evaluating			-0.1347			0.0339
male			(0.01154)			(0.0285)
Year 2011 dummy	-0.1574***	-0.1041*	-0.1197**	0.0412***	0.0264*	0.0298**
	(0.051)	(0.0539)	(0.0547)	(0.0132)	(0.0136)	(0.0135)
Constant	3.1784***	2.0176***	2.1048***	0.8208***	0.508***	0.52***
	(0.2432)	(0.4341)	(0.4762)	(0.0628)	(0.1093)	(0.1176)

See Table 3a notes.

Table 5: Relationships between Evaluators, Presenters, Grades and Distance

Panel A: As of 12th week of the semester, evaluator described presenter as:

Response	Mean	Std. dev.
...a "*Friend*"	0.2065	(0.4055)
...an "*Acquaintance*"	0.1268	(0.3334)
...an "*Enemy*"	0.0000	(0.0000)
..."*Do not know well enough to say"*	0.6667	(0.4705)

N = 274.

Panel B: Correlation Matrix

	Grade	Distance
Grade	1.0000	
Distance	-0.1646***	1.0000
"*Friend*" dummy	0.1106*	-0.1476**
"*Acquaintance*" dummy variable	0.0231	-0.1565***
"*Do not know…*" dummy variable	-0.1211**	0.2259***

N = 274. "***", "**", and "*" denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 6a: Tobit Coefficients, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification I

Variable:	(a)	(b)	(c)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	0.3338***	0.3078***	0.3302**
	(0.1206)	(0.1186)	(0.1351)
Evaluator considers presenter an	-0.125	-0.1102	-0.0502
"acquaintance"	(0.143)	(0.1406)	(0.1481)
Q1: "Yes"	0.5897***	0.6174***	0.5163***
	(0.188)	(0.1846)	(0.1789)
Q2a: "Yes"	0.5271***	0.544***	0.5569***
	(0.1358)	(0.1348)	(0.1324)
Q2b: "Yes"	0.4259***	0.4076***	0.4636***
	(0.1126)	(0.1107)	(0.1084)
Q3a: "Yes"	-0.0203	-0.0162	-0.0367
	(0.2769)	(0.2748)	(0.2667)
Q3b: "Yes"	0.7531***	0.6873***	0.6222***
	(0.1164)	(0.1169)	(0.1127)
Q3c: "Yes"	0.4575***	0.4011***	0.4444***
	(0.1247)	(0.1239)	(0.1202)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.4314***	0.4489***	0.3856***
	(0.1511)	(0.1499)	(0.1452)
Q4b: "Just right"	0.4796***	0.4643***	0.5166***
	(0.1598)	(0.1588)	(0.153)
Q4c: "Excellent"	0.3932***	0.3726***	0.3782***
	(0.0985)	(0.0973)	(0.0949)
Presenter's course grade		1.7808***	1.8469***
		(0.6045)	(0.594)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.2324	0.1762
		(0.4927)	(0.4772)
Presentation day		0.0331	0.055
		(0.04)	(0.0487)
Presentation number		0.0522	0.0369
		(0.0555)	(0.0565)
International evaluating international			-0.3897**
			(0.1539)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.0485
			(0.1433)
International evaluating native-born			-0.4861***
			(0.1318)
Female evaluating male			0.0758
			(0.2254)
Male evaluating female			-0.3813*
			(0.2103)
Male evaluating male			-0.2629
			(0.2302)
Constant	5.6981***	4.2733***	4.3084***
	(0.3377)	(0.7973)	(0.8451)
Pseudo R^2	0.2036	0.2164	0.2527

N = 276 for all estimations. Standard errors in parentheses. "***", "**" and "*" denote statistical significance from zero at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 6b: Tobit Marginal Effects (Conditional on being Uncensored), Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification I

Variable:	(d)	(e)	(f)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	0.2291***	0.2145**	0.2346**
	(0.0874)	(0.0869)	(0.1013)
Evaluator considers presenter an "acquaintance"	-0.0927	-0.0825	-0.038
	(0.1036)	(0.103)	(0.1111)
Q1: "Yes"	0.4777***	0.5074***	0.4271***
	(0.1362)	(0.1352)	(0.1342)
Q2a: "Yes"	0.4151***	0.4339***	0.455***
	(0.0984)	(0.0988)	(0.0994)
Q2b: "Yes"	0.3254***	0.3141***	0.3679***
	(0.0816)	(0.0811)	(0.0813)
Q3a: "Yes"	-0.0146	-0.0119	-0.0273
	(0.2006)	(0.2013)	(0.2001)
Q3b: "Yes"	0.6021***	0.5514***	0.5067***
	(0.0844)	(0.0856)	(0.0846)
Q3c: "Yes"	0.3542***	0.3116***	0.3553***
	(0.0904)	(0.0908)	(0.0902)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.3388***	0.3573***	0.3108***
	(0.1094)	(0.1098)	(0.1089)
Q4b: "Just right"	0.3801***	0.371***	0.4255***
	(0.1158)	(0.1164)	(0.1148)
Q4c: "Excellent"	0.2805***	0.2689***	0.2794***
	(0.0713)	(0.0713)	(0.0712)
Presenter's course grade		1.3045***	1.3855***
		(0.4428)	(0.4456)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.1702	0.1322
		(0.3609)	(0.358)
Presentation day		0.0242	0.0412
		(0.0293)	(0.0365)
Presentation number		0.0383	0.0277
		(0.0407)	(0.0424)
International evaluating international			-0.3084***
			(0.1154)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.0366
			(0.1075)
International evaluating native-born			-0.3879***
			(0.0989)
Female evaluating male			0.0563
			(0.1691)
Male evaluating female			-0.3038*
			(0.1578)
Male evaluating male			-0.1978
			(0.1727)
Constant	4.1277***	3.1303***	3.232***
	(0.2446)	(0.584)	(0.634)

See Table 6a notes.

Table 6c: Tobit Marginal Effects (Probability Uncensored), Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification I

Variable:	(g)	(h)	(i)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	-0.0879***	-0.0791***	-0.084***
	(0.0268)	(0.0259)	(0.0283)
Evaluator considers presenter an "acquaintance"	0.0256	0.0223	0.0101
	(0.0318)	(0.0307)	(0.0311)
Q1: "Yes"	-0.0827**	-0.0818**	-0.0687*
	(0.0418)	(0.0403)	(0.0375)
Q2a: "Yes"	-0.0849***	-0.0842***	-0.0798***
	(0.0302)	(0.0294)	(0.0278)
Q2b: "Yes"	-0.0781***	-0.0735***	-0.077***
	(0.025)	(0.0242)	(0.0227)
Q3a: "Yes"	0.0046	0.0036	0.008
	(0.0616)	(0.06)	(0.0559)
Q3b: "Yes"	-0.1141***	-0.1042***	-0.0911***
	(0.0259)	(0.0255)	(0.0236)
Q3c: "Yes"	-0.0794***	-0.0698***	-0.0711***
	(0.0277)	(0.0271)	(0.0252)
Q4a: "Just right"	-0.0702**	-0.0699**	-0.059*
	(0.0336)	(0.0327)	(0.0305)
Q4b: "Just right"	-0.0748**	-0.071**	-0.0706**
	(0.0355)	(0.0347)	(0.0321)
Q4c: "Excellent"	-0.0924***	-0.0859***	-0.0845***
	(0.0219)	(0.0213)	(0.0199)
Presenter's course grade		0.3888***	0.3874***
		(0.132)	(0.1246)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.0507	0.0369
		(0.1076)	(0.1001)
Presentation day		0.0072	0.0115
		(0.0087)	(0.0102)
Presentation number		0.0114	0.0077
		(0.0121)	(0.0118)
International evaluating international			0.0653**
			(0.0323)
Native-born evaluating international			0.01
			(0.03)
International evaluating native-born			0.0786***
			(0.0276)
Female evaluating male			-0.0164
			(0.0473)
Male evaluating female			0.0619
			(0.0441)
Male evaluating male			0.0547
			(0.0483)
Constant	1.2671***	0.9329***	0.9037***
	(0.0751)	(0.174)	(0.1773)

See Table 6a notes.

Table 7a: Tobit Coefficients, Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification II

Variable:	(a)	(b)	(c)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	0.3102***	0.29**	0.2985**
	(0.1163)	(0.1148)	(0.1305)
Evaluator considers presenter an	-0.1378	-0.1197	-0.071
"acquaintance"	(0.1383)	(0.1364)	(0.1442)
Q1 score	0.5845***	0.6112***	0.504***
	(0.1812)	(0.1785)	(0.1738)
Q2a score	0.3836***	0.3906***	0.3997***
	(0.1329)	(0.1322)	(0.1299)
Q2b score	0.4172***	0.4123***	0.4576***
	(0.0989)	(0.0975)	(0.0955)
Q3a score	-0.0133	-0.0161	-0.0151
	(0.2692)	(0.2684)	(0.2608)
Q3b score	0.6698***	0.6116***	0.5486***
	(0.1105)	(0.1114)	(0.1076)
Q3c score	0.4712***	0.4164***	0.453***
	(0.1215)	(0.1211)	(0.1176)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.4373***	0.4657***	0.3987***
	(0.1468)	(0.1463)	(0.1421)
Q4b: "Just right"	0.3834**	0.377**	0.4325***
	(0.1559)	(0.1555)	(0.1503)
Q4c score	0.3338***	0.3196***	0.3002***
	(0.0647)	(0.0658)	(0.0643)
Presenter's course grade		1.5271***	1.6868***
		(0.5924)	(0.5822)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.5031	-0.0985
		(0.4867)	(0.4734)
Presentation day		0.0365	0.068
		(0.039)	(0.0476)
Presentation number		0.0473	0.0335
		(0.0541)	(0.0551)
International evaluating international			-0.3109**
			(0.1498)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.0131
			(0.1396)
International evaluating native-born			-0.458***
			(0.1283)
Female evaluating male			0.1225
			(0.2205)
Male evaluating female			-0.3717*
			(0.2057)
Male evaluating male			-0.1895
			(0.2262)
Constant	2.8764***	1.9729**	1.9499**
	(0.5864)	(0.8992)	(0.9342)
Pseudo R^2	0.2203	0.2313	0.2651

See Table 6a notes.

Table 7b: Tobit Marginal Effects (Conditional on being Uncensored), Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification II

Variable:	(d)	(e)	(f)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	0.2175**	0.2058**	0.2164**
	(0.0857)	(0.0854)	(0.0994)
Evaluator considers presenter an "acquaintance"	-0.1043	-0.0911	-0.0548
	(0.102)	(0.1015)	(0.1098)
Q1 score	0.431***	0.4547***	0.3836***
	(0.1336)	(0.1328)	(0.1323)
Q2a score	0.2829***	0.2906***	0.3042***
	(0.098)	(0.0984)	(0.0988)
Q2b score	0.3076***	0.3068***	0.3483***
	(0.0729)	(0.0725)	(0.0727)
Q3a score	-0.0098	-0.012	-0.0115
	(0.1985)	(0.1997)	(0.1985)
Q3b score	0.4939***	0.4551***	0.4175***
	(0.0815)	(0.0829)	(0.0819)
Q3c score	0.3474***	0.3098***	0.3448***
	(0.0896)	(0.0901)	(0.0895)
Q4a: "Just right"	0.3495***	0.377***	0.3263***
	(0.1083)	(0.1089)	(0.1081)
Q4b: "Just right"	0.3041***	0.3013***	0.3564***
	(0.115)	(0.1157)	(0.1144)
Q4c score	0.2461***	0.2378***	0.2285***
	(0.0477)	(0.0489)	(0.0489)
Presenter's course grade		1.1362***	1.2838***
		(0.4408)	(0.4431)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.3743	-0.075
		(0.3621)	(0.3603)
Presentation day		0.0271	0.0518
		(0.029)	(0.0362)
Presentation number		0.0352	0.0255
		(0.0403)	(0.042)
International evaluating international			-0.2471**
			(0.114)
Native-born evaluating international			-0.01
			(0.1062)
International evaluating native-born			-0.3693***
			(0.0976)
Female evaluating male			0.0919
			(0.1678)
Male evaluating female			-0.2998*
			(0.1565)
Male evaluating male			-0.1445
			(0.1722)
Constant	2.1209***	1.4679**	1.484**
	(0.4324)	(0.6691)	(0.711)

See Table 6a notes.

Table 7c: Tobit Marginal Effects (Probability Uncensored), Dependent Variable: GRADE (1 to 10) - Alternative Specification II

Variable:	(g)	(h)	(i)
Evaluator considers presenter a "friend"	-0.0791***	-0.0724***	-0.0729***
	(0.0251)	(0.0243)	(0.0265)
Evaluator considers presenter an "acquaintance"	0.0269	0.0232	0.0136
	(0.0298)	(0.0289)	(0.0293)
Q1 score	0.1259***	0.1295***	0.1022***
	(0.039)	(0.0378)	(0.0353)
Q2a score	0.0827***	0.0828***	0.0811***
	(0.0286)	(0.028)	(0.0263)
Q2b score	0.0899***	0.0874***	0.0928***
	(0.0213)	(0.0207)	(0.0194)
Q3a score	-0.0029	-0.0034	-0.0031
	(0.058)	(0.0569)	(0.0529)
Q3b score	0.1443***	0.1296***	0.1113***
	(0.0238)	(0.0236)	(0.0218)
Q3c score	0.1015***	0.0882***	0.0919***
	(0.0262)	(0.0257)	(0.0239)
Q4a: "Just right"	-0.0674**	-0.0683**	-0.0575**
	(0.0316)	(0.031)	(0.0288)
Q4b: "Just right"	-0.0612*	-0.0589*	-0.0601**
	(0.0336)	(0.0329)	(0.0305)
Q4c score	0.0719***	0.0677***	0.0609***
	(0.0139)	(0.0139)	(0.013)
Presenter's course grade		0.3236***	0.3422***
		(0.1255)	(0.1181)
Evaluator's course grade		-0.1066	-0.02
		(0.1031)	(0.096)
Presentation day		0.0077	0.0138
		(0.0083)	(0.0096)
Presentation number		0.01	0.0068
		(0.0115)	(0.0112)
International evaluating international			0.0522*
			(0.0304)
Native-born evaluating international			0.0026
			(0.0283)
International evaluating native-born			0.0719***
			(0.026)
Female evaluating male			-0.0263
			(0.0447)
Male evaluating female			0.0581
			(0.0417)
Male evaluating male			0.0382
			(0.0459)
Constant	0.6197***	0.4181**	0.3956**
	(0.1263)	(0.1905)	(0.1895)

See Table 6a notes.